



**REGION V
ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN
AND FAMILIES
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
AND HUMAN SERVICES**

**State Human Services Officials Meeting
June 14 and 15
Chicago, IL**

Prepared by:

Courtney J. Kakuska
Associate

Jeanette M. Hercik, Ph.D.
Project Manager
Caliber Associates
10530 Rosehaven Street
Suite 400
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
Tel: (703) 385-3200
Fax: (703) 385-3206

**Rapid Response
Technical Assistance Project**
Submitted in accordance with:
IDIQ No. 105-98-8403
Task Order 41

Table of Contents

Executive Summary and Key Findings	3
Purpose of the Meeting	6
Interaction of Food Stamps, Medicaid, and TANF – State Perspective	7
1.1. Welfare Reform Research on Medicaid and Food Stamp Utilization	7
1.2. Findings from Group Discussion	8
Interaction of Food Stamps, Medicaid, and TANF – Federal Perspective	9
1.3. Federal Reaction Panel: Food Stamps and Medicaid: What Are We Doing to Move Families to Self-sufficiency?	10
1.4. Open Forum: Identification of Good Ideas and Areas that Need Improvement Regarding Food Stamps and Medicaid.	10
Time Limits and Children	10
1.5. Research on Time Limits and Their Impact on Children: The ACF Evaluation Agenda and What It is Saying.	11
1.6. Group Discussion on Time Limits and Their Impact, TANF Reauthorization, Unspent TANF Funds, and Children’s Issues.....	12
Child and Family Services Review	12
1.7. Panel Discussion: Child and Family Services Reviews – Federal and State Perspectives.....	12
Next Steps	13
EVENT AGENDA	18
PARTICIPANT LIST	21
PARTICIPANT PRIORITIES AND LOCI OF CONTROL	27

Executive Summary and Key Findings

This report details the presentations given and questions, answers, and concerns articulated by members of the ACF Region V States at the June State Human Services Officials Meeting. The report is organized as follows:

Each presentation and/or roundtable discussion is offset to delineate the speakers from the participants. The findings and/or materials presented by the speakers are summarized. Following each presentation, participants engaged in an open discussion. During this discussion, they were able to ask questions of the presenters as well as one another. These questions and associated responses are offset in this report as “Concern” and “Answer.” From the discussion surrounding the questions and answers, the group developed several key points, offset in the report as **Findings**. These findings, all related to either reauthorization or prevention/transition, are presented in their original order in the body of the report. They are also presented below in an expanded and categorized form.

Prevention/Transition

The group findings related to issues of prevention and/or transition are presented in this section.

Finding: Staff Issues (training, turnover, and support) are critical to the effective movement of families to self-sufficiency.

The participants identified the need to adequately support direct contact staff and to provide effective and timely training as job descriptions and expectations change. The group determined that these efforts would help to reduce turnover as well as improve responsiveness when staff changeover does occur.

Finding: People defined as “short term” TANF recipients are more likely to lose Medicaid and Food Stamp benefits when TANF eligibility ends, but less likely to return to TANF. This represents a population with true “short term need.”

Medicaid and Food Stamps serve as critical support services to TANF recipients. When TANF benefits end, those clients who have been receiving TANF for the shortest period of time tend to be more likely to lose the benefits associated with Medicaid and Food Stamps as well. However, even this concurrent loss of benefits does not precipitate a return to TANF. This population then, has a truly “short term” need.

Finding: A subgroup analysis of the research findings is needed to effectively isolate certain demographic characteristics. Potential units of analysis include: those receiving maximum benefits; the severely depressed; the divorced.

Dr. Lewis’ research findings do not include subgroup analyses. Therefore, there is no way to know if certain demographic groups are significantly skewing the various data. The participants agreed that such subgroup analysis would be useful for policy development.

Finding: A philosophical shift is necessary. Instead of equating TANF with “welfare” we must focus on the holistic well being of the family. We must examine the

costs of leaving TANF without the necessary supports and weigh those against providing the supports.

Finding: Reentry is often precipitated by a need to cover children’s health care needs following a job loss.

Finding: The relationship between TANF and child welfare is dependent on the provision of supportive services for families during transition.

These three statements convey an agreement among participants that while the idea of moving people from welfare to self-sufficiency is appealing, doing so without the proper supports often dooms the client to failure. The consensus was that if the goal is successful movement of clients from TANF to work, the necessary supports must be in place. Specifically, these supports must include Medicaid and Food Stamps, as well as access to emergency supports to deal with unexpected difficulties that would, in the absence of support, force the family to return to TANF.

Reauthorization

Several concerns related to reauthorization were raised over the two days. The results of these conversations are presented below.

Finding: The general population sees “entitlement” and “support” as synonyms. However, the work requirement improves the public perception of welfare. This attitude will pervade Congress as long as the economy remains strong. In the event of an economic downturn, potential for modifying the system increases.

As part of a larger concern about reauthorization, participants identified a strong economy and a public perception favoring work as necessary prerequisites to maintenance of the current system. The group identified economic downturn as a significant factor impacting the outcomes of the reauthorization process.

Finding: The maintenance of flexibility with respect to the percentage of funds available to transfer to the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) will be essential to continued success.

Finding: Need maintained flexibility with respect to program design and a change in the work requirement to evaluate participation based on real progress instead of hours worked.

These two statements reflect the concern among participants that reauthorization will restrict creativity and flexibility in program design. States feel that they need this flexibility in order to devise programs that are most useful to their clients.

This report describes the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Administration for Families Region V State Human Service Officials Meeting held in Chicago, IL, on June 14-15, 2001.

**REGION V
OFFICE OF FAMILY ASSISTANCE
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**

Purpose of the Meeting

The US Department of Health and Humans Services Administration for Children and Families, Region V includes the States of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin. Twice a year, since June of 1999, the Region has sponsored a series of forums. With the express purpose of providing opportunities for information exchange between State and Federal stakeholders, these forums provide Region V with occasions for sharing ideas, challenges, and strategies for success with regard to the implementation of Welfare Reform. This particular forum focused on Medicaid and Food Stamp utilization, time limits and their impact on children, and the Child and Family Services Review and, held June 14 and 15, was the fifth in the series. Participants gathered to answer the question: “What Are We Doing to Move Families to Self-sufficiency?”

Medicaid and Food Stamp Utilization

Since it peaked in 1994, Food Stamp utilization has decreased by 40 percent. A mounting body of evidence indicates that “many families that leave cash assistance for work remain eligible but do not receive food stamps.” In fact, one national study conducted by the Urban Institute parallels state-level research efforts in finding that only about 42 percent of welfare leavers with income eligibility for food stamps actually received the benefit.¹ Recently, States have adopted policies aimed at increasing utilization. Strategies have included mail-in applications, less stringent income-verification practices, and targeted outreach. This forum afforded States an opportunity to discuss these and other strategies regarding Food Stamp Utilization.

In nearly every State, a significant proportion of families receiving Medicaid are linked to that service via joint TANF, Food Stamp, and Medicaid application processes.² This linkage is encouraging because improvements in utilization of one service should lead to concurrent increases in the other(s). Further, many families not receiving TANF cash assistance are still eligible for Medicaid (or SCHIP) because food stamp income eligibility for families with children is 130 percent of poverty.

Time Limits and Children

As families in an increasing number of States reach either State or Federal time limits, the question of the effect of time limits on children of TANF families is receiving more attention. Recent research indicates that it may be older children and young teens most adversely affected by the movement of their parent(s) into the workforce. Preliminary research from *Child Trends*, As well as early data from ACF, as presented by Howard Rolston, indicates:

Despite the expectation that older children would be relatively less affected by welfare reform than their younger counterparts, recent experimental evaluations of welfare-to-

¹ “Linking Medicaid and Food Stamps: Four Little-Known Facts about the Food Stamp Program.” Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. November 30, 2000. Available: <http://www.cbpp.org>.

² “Linking Medicaid and Food Stamps: Four Little-Known Facts about the Food Stamp Program.” Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. November 30, 2000. Available: <http://www.cbpp.org>.

work programs suggest that the adolescent sons and daughters in welfare households are indeed affected when their parents are assigned to participate in these programs. What's more, it seems that these young people may be negatively affected by this participation.³

Child and Family Services Review

The Child and Family Services (CFS) Review process is intended to accurately gauge “what is actually happening to children and families as a result of their receipt of child welfare services...including family support.” The CFS Review process not only examines key factors related to child well-being, it also considers “the functioning of key systemic factors that affect the ability of State programs to serve children and families effectively, including the State's capacity to generate automated information on the children it serves; the implementation of a case review system and quality assurance procedures; staff training and the availability of a range of services for children and families; the State's relationship with and responsiveness to the communities it serves; and the recruitment of foster and adoptive families.”⁴ As the only State in Region V to have undergone the CFS Review, Minnesota shared its experience with the process.

Interaction of Food Stamps, Medicaid, and TANF – State Perspective

After introductions and opening remarks were conducted, the participants shifted their focus to the interplay of TANF, Food Stamps, and Medicaid; first from the State and then Federal perspectives. This section examines the workshop results during the State perspective discussion.

1.1. Welfare Reform Research on Medicaid and Food Stamp Utilization

Dan Lewis, Professor of Education and Social Policy, Northwestern University

Professor Lewis shared the finding of research conducted with colleagues at the University Consortium on Welfare Reform regarding the interaction of Medicaid and Food Stamps benefits with TANF cash assistance. These findings indicate that concurrent losses of Medicaid and Food Stamp benefits with TANF cash benefits is the single strongest predictor of a return to TANF. This finding has significant policy implications when coupled with consideration of those populations most likely to suffer a concurrent loss of benefits. Specific populations identified as higher risk, and the benefit(s) they were most likely to lose when leaving TANF, included:

- Cook County residents (Medicaid and Food Stamps)
- Minority clients (Medicaid and Food Stamps)
- The unemployed and those with less than a high school education (Medicaid)
- Families who lost TANF benefits due to a missed appointment (sanction) or those who were not aware of transitional benefit rules (Medicaid and Food Stamps)

³ Brooks, Jennifer L., Elizabeth C. Hair, and Martha J. Zaslow. “Welfare Reform’s Impact on Adolescents: Early Warning Signs.” *Child Trends Research Brief*. July 2001. Available: <http://www.childtrends.org/pdf/WelfareEditBrief.pdf>.

⁴ Golden, Olivia A., Assistant Secretary for Children and Families “Testimony on The Final Rule on Federal Monitoring of State Child Welfare Programs,” February 17, 2000. Available: <http://www.hhs.gov/asl/testify/t000217b.html>.

- African Americans (Medicaid)
- Younger grantees (Medicaid)
- Unemployed (Medicaid)
- Recent TANF entrants (Medicaid and Food Stamps).

Following from these results, Dr. Lewis recommended conceptualizing Medicaid and Food Stamps as income supports to be continued as a family moves from TANF to self-sufficiency.

1.2. Findings from Group Discussion

Following the presentation from Dr. Lewis, participants had an opportunity to react to the presentation and to discuss issues facing their individual States. This section recounts the issues raised by participants and the suggestions they received from their colleagues. General conclusions of the group and/or issues to revisit are offset as “findings.”

Concern: When clients get excited about work and ask to have their cases closed, staff gets excited, too and closes them. We need to make sure that the options for other programs (e.g. food stamps, Medicaid) are fully explained to clients in this situation. In many cases, even if the adults choose not to receive services, they will accept services for the children.

Answer: A system alert function which reminds staff to determine eligibility for other programs/benefits. This is a problem of staff development. Staff must understand that they should offer the services to eligible clients.

Concern: If automatic cut-off is easier for the employee, what happens to the alert system when staff is overtaxed?

Answer: Training. Work toward adopting a strength-based, family-centered model. Partner with the family. The family is the expert in what they need. Focus on needs. Consider one caseworker for each family for the life of their involvement with the system. This type of family contact, including a return to home calls, helps prepare children and prevent new enrollments. Further, there is no incentive to terminate services early because the family will remain your responsibility upon reentry.

Finding: **Staff Issues (training, turnover, support) are critical to the effective movement of families to self-sufficiency.**

Concern: Population is unresponsive to time limit imposition.

Answer: Outreach efforts are needed. Research to assist in targeting the most at-risk populations would be useful.

Finding: **People defined as “short term” TANF recipients are more likely to lose Medicaid and Food Stamp benefits when TANF eligibility ends, but less likely to return to TANF. This represents a population with true “short term need.”**

Finding: A subgroup analysis of the research findings is needed to effectively isolate certain demographic characteristics. Potential units of analysis include: those receiving maximum benefits; the severely depressed; the divorced.

Concern: How do we “facilitate the capacities” of families to succeed?

Answer: Medicaid and Food Stamp eligibility needs to make sense. Examine the package of work supports and their interactions as income supports.

Align programs.

Treat the family as a whole. Collaborate. Advance the idea of “one-stop shopping.” Establish a “neutral place” where families can turn for help.

Finding: A philosophical shift is necessary. Instead of equating TANF with “welfare” we must focus on the holistic well being of the family. We must examine the costs of leaving TANF without the necessary supports and weigh those against providing the supports.

Finding: The general population sees “entitlement” and “support” as synonyms. However, the work requirement improves the public perception of welfare. This attitude will pervade Congress as long as the economy remains strong. In the event of an economic downturn, potential for modifying the system increases.

Finding: Reentry is often precipitated by a need to cover children’s health care needs following a job loss.

To conclude the session, participants responded to the question: *What are some strategies to assist welfare recipients in moving to self-sufficiency?*

- Educate all TANF stakeholders, including service providers, State and Federal governments, and the public.
- Encourage State governments to provide follow-up support for welfare leavers.
- Emphasize the dependent relationship between the move to self-sufficiency and the need for supports like Medicaid, Food Stamps, child care, transportation, etc.
- Evaluate current service demand and supply vs. what was available under AFDC. This evaluation will enable staff to better meet client needs.

Interaction of Food Stamps, Medicaid, and TANF – Federal Perspective

Having spent the first part of the day discussing interaction of Food Stamps, Medicaid, and TANF from the State perspective, the participants shifted their focus to hear from Federal representatives on this topic. Panelist presentations were followed by questions from State participants which were addressed by the Federal representatives and fellow participants.

1.3. Federal Reaction Panel: Food Stamps and Medicaid: What Are We Doing to Move Families to Self-sufficiency?

Dorothy Burke Collins, Regional Administrator, HCFA (CMS)
Theodore O. Bell, Regional Administrator, Department of Agriculture
Ann Burek, Senior Program Specialist, Office of Family Assistance, ACF

Collins: Communication with beneficiaries is often unclear. Some are afraid of government documents because of immigration issues facing members of the household. Appropriate language materials and quality assurance for the delinking of TANF and Medicaid are necessary.

Current State practices: Michigan Low Income Families Program: Wisconsin Face-to-Face Program. In Indiana and Ohio, efforts are reinstating families wrongfully terminated from Medicaid when TANF was lost are underway.

Burek: TANF needs to work with Food Stamps. People believe that time limits apply to Medicaid and Food Stamps. Notices need to be revamped. Region V has three of 16 grant sites for the Supporting Families Initiative. Focus on implementation. Make changes to rules regarding immigrants in order to facilitate accommodation and access.

Current State practices: Michigan is revamping the wording of negative action forms in response to focus group feedback. Illinois is operating a program modeled on the “Secret Shopper” program from Fair Housing. This program tests the responsiveness of the system. Wisconsin integrates TANF and workforce development in order to address needs of hard-to-serve population. Head Start programs can be used to link children in working families above the poverty line to TANF.

1.4. Open Forum: Identification of Good Ideas and Areas that Need Improvement Regarding Food Stamps and Medicaid.

Finding: The maintenance of flexibility with respect to the percentage of funds available to transfer to the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) will be essential to continued success.

Finding: The relationship between TANF and child welfare is dependent on the provision of supportive services for families during transition.

Concern: Inherent conflict between TANF and Food Stamps. They are too different. Sometimes implementation (i.e. mission) must precede policy change. Incremental change is better than no change.

Finding: Need maintained flexibility with respect to program design and a change in the work requirement to evaluate participation based on real progress instead of hours worked.

Time Limits and Children

At this point in the agenda, participants heard from Howard Rolston, Director of the Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation for ACF on the agency's evaluation agenda. Following the presentation, participants exchanged ideas and promising practices about the impact of time limits on children, unspent TANF dollars, and reauthorization.⁵

1.5. Research on Time Limits and Their Impact on Children: The ACF Evaluation Agenda and What It is Saying.

Howard Rolston, Director, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, ACF

Mr. Rolston identified five main conclusions from current studies regarding the impact of time limits on children:

1. Work requirements have little effect on younger children.
2. Work requirements combined with work-based subsidies have a greater impact on younger children. This impact manifests itself mainly as behavioral and social difficulties, even as income of the family increases.
3. Time limits, even when used with short-term income enhancement, lead to reduced income. Data from Connecticut indicates that income growth has positive effects on kids and, therefore, time limits are harmful because when TANF benefits expire, this income growth decreases.
4. Work requirements have a negative impact on older kids. Data from Florida and Canada indicate that those TANF families doing the "best" (i.e. two working parents) in the system suffer the most.
5. Studies indicate little evidence of hardship after time limits are reached. Data indicates similar situations for this group, the employed, and those still receiving TANF benefits.

Howard Rolston addressed the following questions from participants:

Question: How do children in TANF families with work requirements compare to children of working families, so-called "latchkey kids?"

Answer: The data is confounded, but there is some evidence of better outcomes with a better structure.

Question: What does the data say about the differences between TANF families that are working and those that are not?

Answer: Older studies indicate that, generally, children in low-income working families fare similarly to children in TANF families. The exception is health. With respect to health criteria, children in TANF families fare much better.

Question: What about high-income children left alone versus low-income children left alone?

⁵ James Hmurovich, Director of Family and Children, Indiana Family and Social Services Administration, originally scheduled about Indiana's experiences with time limit expiration, was unable to attend the meeting.

Answer: Children do much better in high-income environments, up to a certain point. The data, however, is confounded. Children in high-income families have better educated parents, and better neighborhoods. Susan Mayer has written a book entitled What Money Can't Buy (Harvard University Press) which indicates that, past a certain level, money is not the issue, competency is.

Question: Do you see an increase in utilization of the child welfare system after time limits are reached?

Answer: There is no direct data to support that, but one economic study indicates there may be.

Answer: Michigan is conducting a child well-being follow-up study for all cases closed for failure to cooperate. Less than one percent of families have connections to child welfare because of issues of neglect.

Mr. Rolston sought input on a proposed Federal project intended to predict the effects of Federal time limits based on State experiences. Between October 2000 and January 2001, one-half of States will reach their time limits. The suggestion was for voluntary data collection to answer questions of effects, exemptions, procedures, and contact levels.

1.6. Group Discussion on Time Limits and Their Impact, TANF Reauthorization, Unspent TANF Funds, and Children's Issues.

Participants engaged in an information sharing session detailing promising practices and potential issues in their home States with respect to time limits, reauthorization, and spending.

Concern: How do other States handle non-compliance/vanishers?

Answer: Michigan: As long as adult is fully cooperating, transfer to State-funded initiatives. Established a *Ten Oldest List* for long-term beneficiaries. Partner with workforce development to address needs of under-prepared, multi-barrier families to engage them in something.

Wisconsin: Early intervention, status assessment, case review in first nine months of eligibility.

Child and Family Services Review

Guests from Minnesota, which has recently complete its Child and Family Services Review, were invited to share experiences and lessons with participants. Brief presentations from panelists were followed by question and answer sessions. Following the panel discussion, the group shared concerns and suggestions for the upcoming review process.

1.7. Panel Discussion: Child and Family Services Reviews – Federal and State Perspectives

Dorothy Renstrom, Director, Family and Child Services Division, Minnesota Department of Human Services

Mary Doran, Child Welfare Program Specialist, ACF

Dorothy Renstrom presented several lessons learned in her States' Child and Family Services Review process. She encouraged States to consider the review as a learning process and opportunity for improvement. She emphasized the need to begin early, including the establishment of a consulting team and selection of site-visit locations.

Renstrom described the general process of the evaluation. It is based on the 75th percentile. Reviewers will examine 50 case files and conduct interviews with stakeholders at each of the sites. Focus less on compliance than on outcomes for children. Conceive of the review as a search for best practices resulting in a comprehensive, strength-based summary.

Question: Would you make any infrastructure changes to make your next review better?
Answer: MN made a *Program Improvement Plan* and will adopt the Quality Assurance Measures therein contained.

Question: How would you recommend we use our time?
Answer: Renstrom gave three suggestions:

1. Start at least eight months before the review is to take place. If sites are selected late, they are disadvantaged because the planning began before they got on board.
2. Data, data, data. Make sure it is comprehensive and understandable.
3. Understand the role of sites.

At this point, Mary Doran gave a brief presentation of the Child and Family Services Review process from the Federal perspective. She indicated that the Statewide Assessment is more critical than the on-site examination. A Statewide consulting team will force communication and shared perspective and, therefore, should be established and utilized. A condensed version of the Statewide Assessment appears in the final report along with what was learned on-site. Doran recommended ensuring that the State Coordinator is knowledgeable and working with knowledgeable people at the State and county levels. Further, Doran recommended streamlining the process, partnering with the Federal level, and improving system/analytical capacity.

Question: What is the time frame for writing the report?
Answer: Reports are due 28 days from the day that the team leaves the State.

Question: What helps in writing the report?
Answer: Review the team comments. Use the Statewide Assessment as a point of comparison.

Question: What about standards? Other challenges?
Answer: We're still out of compliance. Data from the self-assessment isn't enough to change programs. We needed the on-site review and feedback on interaction between families and workers as well as assessment. We're working on service matching, case readiness and structured decision-making.

Next Steps

Participants concluded their time together to revisit opportunities and challenges identified over the two-days, examine their roles in addressing them, develop action steps, and prioritize agenda

items for future forums. The specific results of these discussions are presented in the appendix entitled *Participant Priorities and Loci of Control*.

The agenda priorities identified by the group for the next forum are:

1. Prevention strategies – how can States work to ensure that families do not ever need TANF?
Specific concern was raised about multi-generation dependency and re-enrollment.
2. Reauthorization of TANF – States are concerned about possible changes, especially with respect to reduced flexibility and/or reduction in the funding allocations.

After some discussion, it was agreed that the date for the next forum will be determined by Joyce Thomas her staff.

Meeting Evaluation

At the conclusion of the meeting, participants were asked to complete evaluation forms to facilitate improvements in future meetings. Seven people⁶ completed and returned the forms. This section of the report details those responses.

Question #1

The first question asked participants to rate the following items on a scale of 1 to 4 (1=poor, 4=excellent). Table E.1 depicts the results.

Table E.1

	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Poor (1)	Average
Pre-meeting information/registration	2	3	1	1	2.9
On-site registration	6	1	0	0	3.9
Participant packets/resource materials	4	3	0	0	3.6
Meeting organization/flow of the day	1	5	0	0	3.2
Support Services					
Meeting facility	3	4	0	0	3.4
Food services	2	5	0	0	3.3
Overall meeting	2	5	0	0	3.3

Participants were also given the opportunity to comment on these items. Comments received are presented below, grouped by item.

Pre-meeting information/registration

- “Agenda was originally cast as TANF time limits. Only 2 hours were devoted to it. We would have sent different people for Medicaid/Food Stamps and child welfare.”

Participant packets/resource materials

- “Putting handouts on disk was an excellent idea.”
- “Materials provided excellent background structure for the presentations and discussion.”
- “Good idea to include articles on disk (electronic format)!”

Meeting organization/flow of the day

- “Splitting the meeting into a morning and afternoon session was very helpful. We are all busy and this schedule allowed us to get some work done on both days.”
- “The first day was better; understand [agenda change was] out of control.”

Support Services – Meeting facility

⁶ Not all participants answered all questions. Therefore, not all response totals sum to seven.

- “Air flow made it difficult to hear at times – need better sound or remind to speak louder.”

Overall Meeting

- “Provided opportunity to learn and share with other sites.”
- “I greatly enjoyed the discussion and look forward to prevention strategies [the next forum].”
- “Too bad so few State folks on Friday.”
- “Better than past meetings in booking discussions.”

Question #2

The second question asked participants to rate their agreement with two statements on a scale of 1 to 5 (1=strongly disagree; 5=strongly agree). The results are show in Table E.2.

Table E.2

	1	2	3	4	5	Average
The meeting provided information that will be useful to my State in advancing and/or enhancing the TANF program	0	0	2	4	1	3.9
The meeting provided information that will be useful to my State in advancing and/or enhancing the child welfare program	0	0	2	5	0	3.7

From this point on, participants were asked open-ended questions. These questions, and the participants’ answers, are presented below.

Question #3

Describe the benefits to your State program that you anticipate as a result of this meeting.

- “Understanding of Federal research agenda and findings to date will be helpful for State planning.”
- “The research findings will assist in preparation for State Legislature and reauthorization. Definitely brings home the need for quantifiable data to inform the public policy debate.”
- “Input into ACF agenda. ACF research priorities.”
- “Research presentation provided several areas for possible follow-up in our State. CFSR site preparation from State perspective very helpful.”
- “Better understanding of what may happen with families who hit time limits. IL has not reached this point yet.”
- “New research ideas from discussion with Howard [Rolston]. Ideas from other States on intervention/tracking services.”
- “Identified research/upcoming child and family review.”

Question#4

Identify what was most useful about the meeting

- “Presentation on research forthcoming.”
- “Interaction with States.”
- “Sharing with other States with differing TANF programs, policy/structure.”
- “Opportunity to share issues and best practices with other States. Discussion and updates from Region V staff.”
- “Input into ACF agenda. ACF research priorities.”
- “Sharing experiences and perspectives with others. Discussions surrounding intersections among TANF, Medicaid, and Food Stamps highlight complexity of issue and potential for systemic reform.”
- “The research findings presented by Howard Rolston and Dan Lewis gave useful insights on the impact of welfare reform on children and their families.”

Question #5

How could this meeting have better met your needs?

- “Build more flexibility into agenda/presentations to accommodate changing audience demographics.”
- “More opportunities to hear State perspective. More focused discussion questions.”
- “Having the right mix of people from our State.”
- “Having both cash assistance and child welfare responsibilities, dual agenda focus was on target.”
- “More discussion of key State areas of concern.”

Question #6

Comments

- “Facilitator ok, but feel it slowed discussion and cause some confusion at points (not personal – just didn’t seem necessary to process with this group.”
- “Appreciated opportunity to assist in direction setting.”
- “Request bundling of work-related programs vs. work supports (Food Stamps and Medicaid), child welfare. Invite regional DOL staff for “integrative” program.”

EVENT AGENDA



**Administration for Children and Families
Midwest Hub
Region V
State Human Services Officials
June 14-15, 2001**



Meeting Agenda

Thursday, June 14, 2001

- 12:30 p.m. Lunch Served
- 1:00 p.m. **Meeting Opening and Introduction**
Joyce A. Thomas, Director, Midwest Hub, Administration for Children and Families
- 1:10 p.m. **Welcome to the Department of Health and Human Services**
Suzanne Krohn, Acting Regional Director, Region V, Department of Health and Human Services.
- 1:15 p.m. **Presentation: Welfare Reform Research on Medicaid and Food Stamp Utilization**
Dan A. Lewis, Professor, School of Education and Social Policy, Northwestern University
- 2:15 p.m. **Group Discussion on the Dan Lewis Presentation**
Murriell Orendorff, Facilitator
- 2:45 p.m. **Break**
- 3:00 p.m. **Federal Reaction Panel Discussion: Food Stamps and Medicaid: What Are We Doing to Move Families Toward Self-sufficiency?**
Dorothy Burk Collins, Regional Administrator, HCF
Theodore O. Bell, Regional Administrator, USDA
Ann Burek, Senior Program Specialist, OFA, ACF
- 3:50 p.m. **Open Forum: Identification of Good Ideas and Areas that Need Improvement Regarding Food Stamps and Medicaid. How Do We Work Together as We Move Families Toward Self-sufficiency?**
Murriell Orendorff, Facilitator
- 4:45 p.m. **Future Strategies and Next Steps**
- 5:15 p.m. **Meeting Adjourns for the Day**
- 6:30 p.m. **Dinner**

Friday, June 15, 2001

- 8:00 a.m. **Continental Breakfast**
- 8:30 a.m. **Presentation: *Research on Time Limits and Their Impact on Children: The ACF Evaluation Agenda and What it is Saying***
- 9:30 a.m. **State Perspective on Time Limits**
James Hmurovich, Director, Division of Family and Children,
Indiana Family and Social Services Administration.
- 9:45 a.m. **Group Discussion on Time Limits and Their Impact, TANF Reauthorization, Unspent TANF Funds, and Children's Issues: *What Are States doing in these Areas?***
Murriell Orendorff, Facilitator
- 10:30 a.m. **Break**
- 10:45 a.m. **Child and Family Services Reviews: Federal and State Perspectives**
Dorothy Renstrom, Director, Family and Children Services
Division, Minnesota Department of Human Services
Mary Doran, Child Welfare Program Specialist, Administration
for Children and Families, Region V.
- 11:45 a.m. **Group Discussion on CFS Reviews, Data Issues, Stakeholder Involvement, and Release of Reviews**
Murriell Orendorff, Facilitator
- 12:30 p.m. **Identification of Action Items and Closing**
- 1:00 p.m. **Meeting Adjourns**

PARTICIPANT LIST

Theodore Bell
Regional Administrator
Midwest Region
Food and Nutrition Service
United States Department of Agriculture
77 West Jackson
20th Floor
Chicago, IL 60604
Phone: (312) 353-6664
Fax: (312) 886-2475
E-mail: ted.bell@fns.usda.gov

Ann Burek
Senior Program Specialist
Office of Family Assistance
Administration for Children and Families
Department of Health and Human Services
370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW
Aerospace Building
Washington, DC 20447
Phone: (202) 401-4528
Fax: (202) 205-5887
E-mail: aburek@acf.dhhs.gov

Bill Clair
Public Affairs and Communications Liaison
Region V
Administration for Children and Families
Department of Health and Human Services
233 North Michigan Avenue
Suite 400
Chicago, IL 60601
Phone: (312) 353-0166
Fax: (312) 353-2228
E-mail: bclair@acf.dhhs.gov

Dorothy Burk Collins
Regional Administrator
Region V
Health Care Financing Administration
233 North Michigan Avenue
Suite 600
Chicago, IL 60601-5519
Phone: (312) 886-6432
Fax: (312) 353-0252
E-mail: dbcollins@hcfa.gov

Lynda Crandall
Director
Family Independence Services
Administration
Michigan Family Independence Agency

235 South Grand Avenue
Suite 1306
Lansing, MI 48909
Phone: (517) 335-3094
Fax: (517) 335-7771
E-mail: crandall@state.mi.us

Mary Doran
Program Specialist
Region V
Administration for Children and Families
Department of Health and Human Services
233 North Michigan Avenue
Suite 400
Chicago, IL 60601
Phone: (312) 886-4597
Fax: (312) 353-2204
E-mail: mdoran@acf.dhhs.gov

Amina Everett
Director
Division of Community Operations
Illinois Department of Human Services
100 South Grand Avenue, East
3rd Floor
Springfield, IL 62762
Phone: (217) 782-1210
Fax: (217) 782-8496
E-mail: dhscoby@dhs.state.il.us

Jennifer Gardner
Program Specialist
Administration for Children and Families
Region V
U.S. Department of Health and Human
Services
233 North Michigan Avenue
Suite 400
Chicago, IL 60601
Phone: (312) 886-5333
Fax: (312) 353-2204
E-mail: jgardner@acf.dhhs.gov

Ollice Holden
FSP Director
U.S. Department of Agriculture
77 West Jackson Boulevard
Chicago, IL 60604
Phone: (312) 353-1533
E-mail: ocholden@fns.usda.gov

Douglas E. Howard
Director
Michigan Family Independence Agency
235 South Grand Avenue
Suite 1514
Lansing, MI 48909
Phone: (517) 373-2000
Fax: (517) 335-6101
E-mail: howardd3@state.mi.us

James Kaufmann
Legislative Liaison
Illinois Department of Children and Family
Services
406 East Monroe Street
Station 75
Springfield, IL 62701
Phone: (217) 785-2504
Fax: (217) 785-8068
E-mail: jkaufman@idcfs.state.il.us

Suzanne Krohn
Acting Regional Director
U.S. Department of Health and Human
Services
230 North Michigan Avenue
13th Floor
Chicago, IL 60601
Phone: (312) 353-5132
Fax: (312) 353-4144
E-mail: skrohn@os.dhhs.gov

Mary Ann Langston
Associate Director
Office of Financial Support Services
Illinois Department of Human Services
100 South Grand Avenue, East
2nd Floor
Springfield, IL 62762
Phone: (217) 782-1213
Fax: (217) 524-5310
E-mail: dhsd4040@dhs.state.il.us

Linda Lawrence
Team Administrator
Region V
Administration for Children and Families
Department of Health and Human Services
233 North Michigan Avenue

Suite 400
Chicago, IL 60601
Phone: (312) 353-7481
Fax: (312) 353-2204
E-mail: llawrence@acf.dhhs.gov

Hyesun Lee
Health Insurance Specialist
Health Care Financing Administration
Region V
233 North Michigan Avenue
Chicago, IL 60601
Phone: (312) 353-1565
Fax: (312) 353-3866
E-mail: hlee2@hcfa.gov

Dan Lewis
Professor
School of Education and Social Policy
Northwestern University
2115 North Campus Drive
Evanston, IL 60208
Phone: (847) 491-3790
Fax: (847) 467-2495
E-mail: dlewis@nwu.edu

Karen Maxson
Director
Division of Transitional Services
Office of Employment and Training
Illinois Department of Human Services
100 South Grand Avenue, East
Springfield, IL 62762
Phone: (217) 785-9692
Fax: (217) 557-0473
E-mail: dhsd62lo@dhs.state.il.us

Gene Niewoehner
TANF Program Specialist
Region V
Administration for Children and Families
Department of Health and Human Services
233 North Michigan Avenue
Suite 400
Chicago, IL 60601
Phone: (312) 353-5182
Fax: (312) 886-5373
E-mail: gniewoehner@acf.dhhs.gov

James Nye

Director
Outstate Operations
Michigan Family Independence Agency
235 South Grand Avenue
Suite 1401
Lansing, MI 48909
Phone: (517) 373-3570
Fax: (517) 373-0708
E-mail: nyej3@state.mi.us

Murriael Orendorff
Partner
Millennia Consulting
28 East Jackson Boulevard
Suite 1700
Chicago, IL 60604
Phone: (312) 922-9920
Fax: (312) 922-0955
E-mail: morendorff@consultmillennia.com

Dorothy Renstrom
Director
Family and Children Services
Minnesota Department of Human Services
444 Lafayette Street
St. Paul, MN 55155
Phone: (651) 297-5303
Fax: (651) 297-1949
E-mail: dorothy.renstrom@state.mn.us

Howard Rolston
Director
Office of Planning Research and Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
Department of Health and Human Services
370 L'Enfant Promenade
Washington, DC 20447
Phone: (202) 401-9290
Fax: (202) 205-3598
E-mail: hrolston@acf.dhhs.gov

Mary Rowin
Deputy Administrator
Division of Workforce Solutions
Wisconsin Department of Workforce
Development
201 East Washington Avenue
Room A200
Madison, WI 53702
Phone: (608) 267-9022
Fax: (608) 261-6376

E-mail: rowinma@dwd.state.wi.us

Tom Schindler
Program Specialist
Region V
Office of Family Self Sufficiency
Administration for Children and Families
Department of Health and Human Services
233 North Michigan Avenue
Suite 400
Chicago, IL 60601
Phone: (312) 886-9540
Fax: (312) 886-5373
E-mail: tschindler@acf.dhhs.gov

Ila Schneibel
Co-Director
Families With Children
Minnesota Department of Human Services
444 Lafayette Road, North
St. Paul, MN 55155
Phone: (651) 296-6056
Fax: (651) 297-5840
E-mail: ila.schneibel@state.mn.us

Amy Bush Stevens
Project Coordinator
Illinois Families Study
Institute for Policy Research/Institute for
Health Services Research and Policy
Studies
Northwestern University
2040 Sheridan Road
Evanston, IL 60208
Phone: (847) 491-5889
Fax: (847) 491-9916
E-mail: a-stevens4@northwestern.edu

Joyce A. Thomas
Hub Director
Midwest Hub
Administration for Children and Families
Department of Health and Human Services
233 North Michigan Avenue
Suite 400
Chicago, IL 60601
Phone: (312) 353-4237
Fax: (312) 353-2204
E-mail: jthomas@acf.dhhs.gov

Leonard Tufo
Program Specialist
Region V
Administration for Children and Families
Department of Health and Human Services
233 North Michigan Avenue
Suite 400
Chicago, IL 60601
Phone: (312) 353-7484
Fax: (312) 353-2204
E-mail: ltufo@acf.dhhs.gov

L. Kent Wilcox
Director
Office of Family Self Sufficiency
Midwest Hub
Administration for Children and Families
Department of Health and Human Services
233 North Michigan Avenue
Suite 400
Chicago, IL 60601
Phone: (312) 886-6375
Fax: (312) 353-2204
E-mail: kwilcox@acf.dhhs.gov

Kay Willmoth
Director
Office of Family and Child Development
Midwest Hub
Administration for Children and Families
Department of Health and Human Services
233 North Michigan Avenue
Suite 400
Chicago, IL 60601
Phone: (312) 353-7562
Fax: (312) 353-2204
E-mail: kwillmoth@acf.dhhs.gov

Carolyn Wilson-Hurey
Team Administrator
Region V
Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin State Team
Office of Family Self Sufficiency
Administration for Children and Families
Department of Health and Human Services
233 North Michigan Avenue
Suite 400
Chicago, IL 60601
Phone: (312) 353-9672
Fax: (312) 886-5373
E-mail: cwilson-hurey@acf.dhhs.gov

PARTICIPANT PRIORITIES AND LOCI OF CONTROL

Participant Priorities and Loci of Control

This section describes the final discussion of prioritization, action step identification, and determination of level of control by the meeting participants. Issues of concern raised by participants are presented in the left-most column. The second column indicates those issues over which participants felt they had some level of control and/or influence. The last column tabulates the number of participants voting for the issue as one of priority for the next meeting.

Issue	Control or Influence?	Priority Votes
Integration of Programs/Flexibility based on need		0
Staff Training/Buy-In	Control	0
Delinking Medicaid and TANF		0
SSI Eligibility		1
Reauthorization of TANF	Influence	5
Elimination of Silos (Establishment of One-stops)		0
Technical Support		2
TANF and Child Welfare Eligibility and Relationships		4
Relationship between TANF and Food Stamps	Influence	0
Outreach and Public Image	Control	3
High level priority for TANF and Food Stamps (a "Champion")		0
Customizing Communication to Meet Needs of Family Structure		0
Holistic Case Management		0

The final outcome of the discussion was the placement of two items on the agenda for the next forum: Reauthorization of TANF, and Prevention Strategies. Prevention Strategies was a late addition viewed by many participants as a means of addressing several of the identified issues simultaneously.

Having identified the issues, participants turned their attention to developing action items that might lead to their resolution. In some cases, it was clear to the participants that certain action steps would facilitate the achievement of multiple goals. Therefore, the group developed four major themes into which most of the issues and action items could be grouped. These themes, and the issues they encompass, are:

Internal Stakeholders	External Stakeholders	Holistic Case Management	Collaboration
Employee training	Education/Awareness	Eliminate silos	
Determine challenges	Outreach	Focus on employment	
Worker buy-in and education on benefits		Link children to TANF eligibility	
		Residual transition programs	

Specific action items were developed for seven of the issue areas identified. These items are presented below.

SSI Eligibility
Quicker Involvement

Integration of Programs
Relationships between TANF and Food Stamps

More Flexibility

Reauthorization of TANF

TANF & Child Welfare Relationships

Develop supportive relationships

Technical Support

Software to support case management

Staff Issues

Training on benefits

Address burn-out/turnover

Decision making skills

Lifetime assignment

Eliminate Silos

Flexibility with Medicaid and Food Stamps

Delinking of Medicaid and TANF

TANF and Food Stamps

Need a "champion"

Unified voices

High level priority

Mission clarity